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Reviewer's report:

Line 179-180: I still do not understand why greater transparency could avoid citations in some kinds of papers. I do not see the logic of this in the context of the research conducted and reported in this paper.

Overall, while the manuscript has improved since the first version, I still had to read it several times to understand how the present study connects with the old ones. Two studies were conducted several years ago, but I do not understand why a pooled analysis is desirable of those two studies.

In essence, the comments provided by the authors in the point-by-point response are clearer than the wording of the article, especially when responding to reviewer 1’s comments, which, by the way, I agree with (e.g., when they explain why not to focus on top level journals.)

When the authors say "We have definitively shown that randomised studies for improving scientific impact, measured by the number of WoS citations are feasible" I still do not see the reason why this paper is providing such definitive proof. Likewise, I do not see this statement as significantly contributing to the importance of this study in particular.

Overall, the authors have clarified their manuscript vis-à-vis the first version, but it is still a tough read, and still hard to follow and to grasp why this study is important, contributes to better journal editorial processes, and is novel in any way. Moreover, reporting guidelines were not developed to increase citations, but to make life easier for systematic reviewers.

As a final comment, I think the authors should make a more compelling case as to the need for this study, what this study adds to current knowledge, and how this could shape future editorial policies. This is not adequately conveyed in this manuscript. Notwithstanding, I would not advise against publishing this manuscript, just that the authors should try to make their paper more reader-friendly, correct some style issues still present, and attempt to organize their report in such a way that one shouldn't have to read over and over again to understand what was done, why it was done, and what it all means.
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